

REMARKS**Claim Amendments**

Claims 4 and 5 have been deleted. Claims 3 and 10 have been rewritten to overcome the objections raised by the Examiner. New claims 11 and 12 have been added. Claims 3, 6-12 are pending. The objections raised by the Examiner have been addressed. Noted is that claim 8 has not been amended since antecedent basis for "said focal axis" appears in claim 3.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

1. Claims 3, 7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doong (6,789,929) in view of Uchida (6,821,005). The Examiner states it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the pivoting system of Uchida in the headlight of Doong to obtain a beam which has excellent visibility at a short distance in the forward part of a vehicle and can be prevented from being changed into glare light for a vehicle driving in the opposite direction.

Applicant's invention can be differentiated from the Doong-Uchida combination. First the Doong reference pertains to a lampshade used at home (see Fig. 7 and Col. 3, lines 64-66) rather than to a vehicular headlight. The purpose of the invention taught in Doong is not the reflective capability of a headlight, but rather the reflection of light between two mirror layers and guided toward the light admitting face on the outside peripheral wall (Col 1, lines 53-67). In other words, light is reflected between two reflective surfaces and which exits out the outer periphery (see Fig. 2 and Fig. 7).

As the Examiner has stated, Doong does not show a pivot support means. Uchida does disclose ball joints acting as pivot supports 14 and 15 (see Fig. 3). The Examiner states it is not explicitly stated that the pivot support means for the reflector and the electrical power means that moves the light source are the same item. However, Fig. 3 clearly illustrates that the motor M is driven to tilt reflector 20A (Col. 7, lines 52-56). Uchida does not teach or suggest that the motor operating displacement of the reflector can be used for any other purpose.

Nevertheless, claim 3 has been amended to more concisely describe the invention and avoid the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 3 includes the further limitations of:

- a) "a rack having a first side fixedly connected to said conduit". Support can be found found in the specification page 7, lines 16-18 and Figs. 3 and 4;
- b) "said teeth orientated on a line that is acutely angled relative to the axis of said conduit, for movement of the tubular conduit in both horizontal and vertical directions". Support can be found by viewing Figs. 3 and 4 together;
- c) "the reflector is adjusted from a generally horizontal orientation to a downwardly-tilted orientation in response to the vertical movement of said conduit as the electrical power means displaces the tubular conduit of the light source from the high beam position to the low beam position". Support can be found by viewing Figs. 3 and 4 together.

It is clear that rack 40 is fixedly connected to tubular conduit 20. Fig. 3 illustrates the high beam position and the conduit is in a substantially horizontal position. As the conduit is displaced forward to the low beam position, the rack teeth elevate or displace the conduit in a vertical direction relative to the slope of the gear teeth. As the conduit is elevated as it moves forward, the elevation causes reflector 12 to orientate downward.

No separate power means is utilized for the pivoting change. None of the prior art cited by the Examiner cites an angulation change except for the Taniuchi et al reference (5,971,574). Taniuchi's angled adjusting arm or slider 62 relates only to movement of the light source and not to any pivoting movement of the reflector 4 (see Fig. 2). It is noted however, that Taniuchi illustrates movement of the reflector 4 relative to the position of the light source (see Fig. 1) but this does not appear to pivot the reflector.

Further, none of the art cited by the Examiner teach a light source having a tubular conduit that when displaced forward away from, or back towards a reflector, the reflector will pivot in response to the displacement.

Applicant believes the added limitations set forth in a), b) and c) above place pending claim 3 in a condition for allowance as well as dependent claims 6-10.

2. Applicant has added new claim 11 which depends from claim 3 adding a tube guide roller assembly for maintaining the teeth of said rack in mesh with said pinion gear. Support is found in the specification at page 8, lines 9-14.

The cited prior art does not disclose a tube guide roller assembly for maintaining rack teeth in mesh with the pinion gear. On this basis, Applicant believes new claim 11 to be allowable.

3. New claim 12 is an independent claim combining the elements of claims 3 and 11. Applicant believes this claim, in view of the cited prior art, should be allowable.

Since the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest movement of the light source and pivoting action responsive to the tubular conduit displacement and use of a guide roller assembly, Applicant believes the rejection based on obviousness has been overcome and that pending claims 3, 6-12 are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 28, 2006



Ralph D. Chabot, Reg. No. 39,133
Attorney for Applicant

CHABOT & ASSOCIATES
2310 E. Ponderosa Drive, Suite 4
Camarillo, CA 93010-4747
(805) 388-5028